DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 222 SP 026 923

AUTHOR Doyle, Walter
TITLE Classroom Management and the Curriculum: A Strategic Research Site. R&D Report 6162.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jun 85
CONTRACT NIE-G-83-0006-P1
NOTE 33p.
AVAILABLE FROM Communication Services, R&DCTE, EDA 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Curriculum Development; *Educational Objectives; *Instructional Design; Instructional Improvement; Learning Strategies; *Research Needs; *Teacher Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This paper defines a strategic site for research in classroom management, namely, the tension between management and curriculum. Programs of action in classrooms are defined both by the rules for social participation and the demands of academic work. Academic work is directly involved in the process of achieving classroom order, and can be shaped in basic ways by a teacher's management decisions. The research reviewed in this paper suggests that academic work can be swamped by the management function in teaching, and teachers can become preoccupied with getting work accomplished rather than promoting student learning. When this happens, management limits students' opportunities to learn, even though engagement may be high. In such circumstances, a well-managed class would not be a high achieving class. At the same time, some challenging academic tasks are difficult to manage in classrooms. When such tasks are being used, the class may not score high on such management indicators as attention and engagement. Nevertheless, students are being afforded the chance to learn important aspects of the curriculum. Two implications of these considerations are discussed: (1) content needs to be included in studies of classroom management, and (2) resolving the tension between management and curriculum in classrooms may actually require a greater emphasis on management. A 10-page reference list is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264222

Classroom Management and the Curriculum:

A Strategic Research Site

Walter Doyle

SP 036923

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

(R&D Report 6162)

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

June 1985

During the writing of this paper, the author was supported in part by the National Institute of Education, Contract NIE-G-83-0006, P1, Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Project. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the NIE and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred. This paper is drawn from W. Doyle, Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, in press.

Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Communication Services, R&DCTE, EDA 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

Classroom Management and the Curriculum:
A Strategic Research Site

Walter Doyle

My purpose in this paper is to define a strategic site for research in classroom management, viz., the tension between management and curriculum. I will do this primarily by examining the character of the problem and describing its significance for theory and practice in teaching. This analysis is drawn from a larger review of the research on classroom organization and management that I wrote for the third edition of the Handbook of Research on Teaching (Doyle, 1985).

Curriculum in Classroom Management Research

Concern for a connection between classroom management and curriculum has not been prominent in research on teaching. Even when subject matter is "controlled" by limiting observations to management processes in particular content areas such as math and English, specific features of the curriculum are typically not incorporated in the analysis of data. I hasten to add that this neglect of curriculum is a common feature of most research on teaching, even when the focus is on instruction.

To the extent that the issue is addressed at all, it is commonly assumed that good management enables students to learn the curriculum. Recent efforts in the process-product tradition to correlate management variables with student achievement, either directly or through student engagement (e.g., Emmer & Evertson, 1981), imply that management supports curriculum and that management indicators are potentially useful to judge or promote effectiveness in teaching.

Yet, beyond the general belief that students cannot direct their energies to learning content without some semblance of order in a class, there are few theoretically interesting ways to trace a connection between management actions and student learning. Moreover, several investigators have recently sounded a note of caution. Some have argued that a preoccupation with management in the classroom can lead to a neglect of instruction (see Allington, 1983; Brophy, 1982; Duffy & McIntyre, 1982). Thus activities are accomplished but students do not always understand what they are doing or have opportunities for meaningful practice. Others have noted that relationships between achievement and management indicators such as work involvement and low frequencies of inappropriate and disruptive behaviors are not consistent. Some teachers have high management ratings and low achievement and some have high achievement and low management ratings (Doyle, 1984). Finally, recent studies of academic work suggest that the problem goes even deeper than this, that curriculum can be shaped by management in ways that seriously limit what students are likely to learn in school (Doyle, Sanford, Clements, French, & Emmer, 1983).

The Management Function in Teaching

To understand these apparent tensions between management and curriculum, it is necessary to establish a perspective on the management function in teaching. Broadly speaking, classroom teaching has two major task structures organized around the problems of (a) learning and (b) order. Learning is served by the instructional function, that is, by covering a specified block of the curriculum, promoting mastery of elements of that block, and instilling favorable attitudes toward content so that students will persist in their efforts to learn (see

Abrahamson, 1974; Westbury, 1973). Order is served by the managerial function, that is, by organizing classroom groups, establishing rules and procedures, reacting to misbehavior, monitoring and pacing classroom events, and the like (Doyle, 1980).

Obviously the tasks of promoting learning and order are closely intertwined: Some minimal level of orderliness is necessary for instruction to occur and lessons must be sufficiently well constructed to capture and sustain student attention. Indeed, the tasks exist simultaneously so that a teacher often faces competing pressures to maximize learning and sustain order. But the task of learning and the task of order represent quite distinct levels of analysis. Because individuals rather than groups learn, an analysis of learning directs attention to individual processes. But order is a property of a social system and, thus, needs to be framed in a language of group processes.

Toward a Language Of Classroom Order

Order does not necessarily mean passivity, absolute silence, or rigid conformity to rules, although these conditions are sometimes considered necessary for specific purposes (e.g., major test). Order in a classroom simply means that within acceptable limits the students are following the program of action necessary for a particular classroom event to be realized in the situation. Programs of action differ across types of classroom activities, that is, a bounded segment of classroom time characterized by an identifiable arrangement of participants and materials and a specified pattern of communication (see Au, 1980; Doyle, 1979b, 1984; Gump, 1967, 1969; Philips, 1972; Ross, 1984; Stodolsky, Ferguson, & Wimpelberg, 1981; Yinger, 1980). For lectures or seatwork, for example, students are expected to work independently at their desks

and attend to a single information source (see Kounin & Gump, 1974). Whole-class discussions, on the other hand, require that at least some students agree to answer the teacher's questions and students are expected to attend to multiple information sources.

According to this model, classroom order is defined and achieved within contexts and "Each context makes different interactional demands on the members of the class" (Shultz & Florio, 1979, p. 169). To understand classroom order, then, it is necessary to examine the contexts of the classroom and how they are enacted by teachers and students.

Order and Cooperation

From the perspective of order, "cooperation" rather than "engagement" (in the sense of involvement with content) is the minimum requirement for student behavior (see Doyle, 1979b). The term, "cooperation," derived from Grice's (1975) analysis of the "Cooperation Principle" in conversations, is useful for at least two reasons. First, it is a social construct which emphasizes the fact that classroom activities are "jointly constituted" by the participants (Erickson & Shultz, 1981). That is, order, in classrooms as in conversations, is achieved with students and depends upon their willingness to follow along with the unfolding of the event. Second, the term acknowledges the fact that order can, and often does, rest on passive noninvolvement by a least some students. In seatwork, for instance, order exists as long as students are not interacting or distracting one another even though they may not be engaged in working with the content. A whole-class discussion can, and often does (see Adams, 1969), operate with only a few students actually interacting with the teacher and the

others playing the roles of audience members or passive bystanders, that is, "sitting nicely" and listening (Sieber, 1981). Cooperation, in other words, includes both involvement and the program of action for the activity and passive noninvolvement. Misbehavior, on the other hand, is any action by one or more students that threatens to disrupt the activity flow or pull the class toward a program of action that threatens the safety of the group or violates norms of appropriate classroom behavior held by the teacher, the students, or the school staff (see Denscombe, 1980; Gannaway, 1976; Hargreaves, Hester, & Mellor, 1975; Nash, 1976; Pollard, 1980). For an activity to succeed as a social event in a classroom, in other words, sufficient numbers of students must be willing to enact the participant role while the rest at least allow the activity to continue.

It is important to emphasize that the focus here is on the problem of order and not the problem of learning. For the purposes of learning, all students ideally should engage in working with content. But in the daily world of a classroom, order can, and often does, exist without full and continuous engagement by all students in learning tasks. Moreover, passive nonengagement is not necessarily problematic in establishing and sustaining order even though it may be unsatisfactory for learning.

Summary

Classroom management refers, then, to the actions and strategies teachers use to solve the problem of order in classrooms. Because order is a property of a social system, the language of management must be addressed to group dimensions of the classroom environment and to the contexts within which order is defined and achieved. Management is a

complex enterprise because order is jointly accomplished by teachers and students and because a large number of immediate circumstances affect the nature of orderliness, the need for intervention, and the consequences of particular teacher and student actions.

Contexts as Programs of Action

Order in classrooms is defined by the programs of action embedded in classroom activities. In addition to providing slots and sequences for participants' behavior, these programs of action have direction, momentum, and energy (see Arlin, 1979, 1982; Erickson, 1982a; Kounin, 1970). Time does not simply pass in classrooms. Rather, there is rhythmic movement toward the accomplishment of academic and social-interactional ends. In Merritt's (1982) term, classroom activities contain "vectors" that, once entered into, pull event and participants along their course.

Participation Structure

Microethnographic studies of classroom discourse (see Cazden, 1985) have recently focused on a unit of classroom life called "participation structure," that is, the system of rules governing speaking, listening, and turn-taking. This unit is often used to examine differences between the discourse rules of the home culture of ethnic minorities and the participation demands of classrooms (see Au, 1980; Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Philips, 1972; Shultz & Florio, 1979). Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Mehan (1979) have described the participation structure of conventional classrooms in terms of an interactional sequence consisting of initiation, reply, and evaluation or follow-up. These episodes consist of the interconnected moves teachers and students use in classrooms to accomplish interactional goals.

Using transcripts of lessons from secondary classes in England and Australia and a general framework from the ethnography of conversations, McHoul (1978) proposed a set of rules governing turn-taking in whole-class lessons. These rules represent what is essentially a grammar of group lessons rather than a description of an individual teacher's skill or even an effective pattern of interaction. As a grammar, the rules purport to summarize the interaction structures teachers in general try to hold in place in conversational lessons. Naturally there is considerable variation in the actual enactment of these rules on particular occasions. However, to the extent that these rules describe the essential features of group lessons, they depict a familiar program of action for students and teachers. Departures from this familiar pattern are likely to increase the need for interactional work to achieve order.

McHoul argued that, in contrast to natural conversations, the teacher is the only participant in a classroom lesson who can select a topic and elect to take the first turn. In addition, the variety of options for turn-taking in classrooms is limited because the teacher controls the initial selection of a speaker, the duration of a turn (including his or her own turns), and the selection of the next speaker. The student speaking must either continue until the teacher has terminated the turn with a comment that the answer is sufficient, or select the teacher as the next speaker. The student speaking is not allowed, however, to select another student to speak, and other students cannot self-select a turn. Such a rule obviously accounts for the initiation-response-evaluation sequence of conversational episodes in

classroom lessons (see Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman, & Smith, 1966; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). This rule serves to minimize the possibility of overlap, that is, a situation in which a student self-selects to interrupt another student's turn before the teacher has signaled that the answer is adequate or sufficient, even when there are long pauses at the beginning of or during a turn. In natural conversations, such pauses signal possible junctures between turns. In classrooms, an individual student's turn, once it is started, is protected from intrusions by other students. The teacher may, of course, insert prompts to the selected speaker during a turn if the pause is long or the student makes a mistake that affects the meaning of the lesson (see Allington, 1980; Hoffman & Clements, 1984), and such prompts may be solicited from other students. Nevertheless, the teacher controls the scheduling of insertions, and such insertions do not terminate a turn. It is important to note that, in contrast to natural conversations, pauses between student and teacher turns are typically quite short (Rowe, 1974), perhaps because there is virtually no focal activity during these gaps.

McHoul's rules also dealt with the function of hand-raising in classrooms. In addition to enabling a teacher to schedule one-at-a-time turns, this device helps with the problem of selecting a "knowing-and-willing answerer" (p. 201), that is, a student who is likely to stay on topic and have an answer. Thus, the teacher can avoid diversions away from the lesson or unnecessarily long delays in moving through the activity. Occasionally teachers open up turns (i.e., fail to designate a specific answerer) in order to solicit comments, suggestions, or guesses from several students. In addition, a teacher

may open up turns when the answer requires esoteric knowledge that only a few students are likely to know. When such events lead to a jumble of answers, teachers quickly return to protected, one-at-a-time turns. Consistent with Kounin (1970), McHoul also noted that students are usually selected after questions are asked rather than before. The latter practice starts the turn before the question is posed and thus excludes other students from the episode.

Finally, McHoul noted that in natural conversations turn-taking is handled locally at each juncture. Because it is not always necessary for the next speaker to remain strictly on topic or for the conversers to remain organized as a unit, the course of a conversation is often unpredictable and schisms develop in which subgroups follow their own conversational paths. Such permutations would seem to be inconsistent with the task-orientation and content focus of classroom lessons. It is reasonable, therefore, that they are prevented in classrooms by rules which assign control of turns to the teacher.

Academic Work as a Program of Action

It is becoming increasingly clear that subject matter is a significant component of the programs of action in classrooms. Hoffman and Clements (1984) and Englert and Semmel (1983) have reported, for example, that teachers are likely to interrupt reading turns when a student's errors change the meaning of the text and ignore substitutions which are semantically equivalent to words in the text. These data suggest that teachers track the development of content as well as the flow of social interaction. Furthermore, students appear to focus a significant part of their attention in class on information about how to do the work they are assigned as well as what behavior they are to

display (King, 1980, 1983). It would seem, therefore, that subject matter needs to be included more explicitly in research on classroom management. To that end, this section contains a review of some of the emerging theories and research on subject matter processes in classrooms.

Students' tasks in classrooms. Erickson (1982a, 1982b) has developed a case for examining students' learning tasks in classrooms as a composite of a subject matter task structure and a social task structure, both of which contain action slots and sequences. He argues:

> At the level of enactment in real time as an environment, both task dimensions have a sequential organization that must be integrated across dimensions if hitches in the process of accomplishing the task are not to occur. If the subject matter task environment at hand (e.g., an addition problem being done in a classroom) requires carrying from the "ones" column across to the "tens" column, and the student is confused when at the point of carrying, if the social task environment prohibits asking another child for help (because that is defined as inappropriate in the social participation structure), the overall learning task at that point has become more complex. How is the child to get the needed information about an arithmetical operation in a socially appropriate way? This is an example of a sequentially arrived at point at which a learner gets "stuck" because of contradictory demands across the social and academic task dimensions. These sequential points of "stuckness" can become more salient for the learner than the overall task itself. (Erickson, 1982b, p. 172)

Doyle (1979a, 1983) has utilized the notion of "academic tasks" to account for curriculum as a process variable or program of action in classrooms. According to this model, subject matter appears in classroom settings as work, that is, as products to be generated using available instructions and resources (see also Blumenfeld, Hamilton, Bossert, Wessels, & Meece, 1983; deVoss, 1979; Korth & Cornbleth, 1982; LeCompte, 1978). Accountability plays a key role in determining the value or significance of work in a classroom: Products that are evaluated strictly by the teacher are more likely to be seen as serious work, that is, work that "counts" (see Doyle & Carter, 1984; Florio, Clark, Elmore, Martin, Maxwell, & Metheny, 1982; King, 1980; Morrison, 1982; Smith, 1978). At the same time, accountability affects the risk associated with various types of academic tasks. Tasks involving higher cognitive processes of understanding, reasoning, and problem formulation are high in inherent ambiguity and risk for students. Because the precise nature of correct answers cannot be predicted and rehearsed in advance, the possibility of failure is high. Ambiguity and risk, in turn, shape students' attitudes toward the work they do in classrooms. Mayers, Csikszentmihalyi, and Larson (1978), for example, found that high school students had more positive attitudes and higher motivation in "boredom" classes in which the challenges were perceived as less than their skills, than in "worry" classes in which the challenges were perceived as greater than their skills.

Morine-Dershimer (1983) has described an interesting case of how students responded to different task demands during recitations in second-, third-, and fourth-grade classes. When teachers asked convergent questions, frequency of student participation was correlated

with academic ability. When teachers asked divergent questions that emphasized ideas and opinions, nearly all answers were accepted, and the task often became one of simply participating. In these instances, high ability students were often reluctant to respond, and lower ability students participated more often than usual. In addition, students' attention to the comments of other students was low.

Teachers and academic work. For a teacher, the work students do is central to the instruction function but is only one aspect of the creation and management of classroom activities. From the perspective or order, the nature of academic work influences the probability of student cooperation and involvement in a lesson and thus the complexity of the teacher's management task. If, for example, most students find the work too difficult, then few will be able to participate in carrying out the activity. In a study of three junior high school English classes taught by the same teacher, Doyle and Carter (1984) found that academic tasks involving descriptive or expository writing were difficult for the teacher to orchestrate in the classroom. Such tasks, which often extended over several class sessions, were characterized by long introductions, delays between introductions and seatwork segments as the students asked for clarification and assistance in getting started, and frequent student-initiated questions during work periods. In contrast, tasks involving recall or predictable algorithms, such as those found in vocabulary or grammar assignments proceeded smoothly and efficiently.

Similar effects have been reported by other investigators. Atwood (1983), in a study of fourth- through sixth-grade students, found that work involvement in the mixed activities structure (recitation followed

by seatwork) was low with procedurally complex tasks such as reports. In contrast, involvement was high with procedurally simple tasks. In a study of the difficulty level of materials used in reading instruction in 71 second- through sixth-grade classes, Jorgenson (1977) found that students' classroom behavior improved when the reading level of the materials assigned fell below measured ability. Finally, dramatic results were reported by Davis and McKnight (1976) in a study of high ability secondary students who actively resisted an attempt to increase the intellectual demands of tasks in mathematics.

Summary. Academic work carries the substance of classroom events for students and provides a context that guides their attention and information processing as well as their attitudes toward participation and cooperation. Academic work is, therefore, an important dimension of the program or vector of action in classrooms and a significant factor in accounting for how classroom life is organized and how order is achieved.

Classroom Management and Academic Work: A Delicate Balance

This analysis suggests that the curriculum as enacted is implicated in classroom management as a primary vector of action in classroom activities. In other words, the nature of the work students do plays a central role in getting lessons accomplished in real time. Thus, academic work can be used to achieve order. In some instances this use can have positive effects. Doyle (1984) found, for example, that some effective teachers in difficult management situations pushed students through the curriculum as a way of keeping things moving and thus maintaining order. This use of the curriculum would seem to enhance both order and learning. Recently, however, increasing attention is

being given to the possibility that the decisions teachers make to enhance order lower the quality of academic work and thus defeat the purposes and the effects of the curriculum. In this section I review some of the research that bears on this tension between management and the curriculum.

Negotiating the Demands of Academic Work

Classroom studies indicate that the demands of academic work are shaped by a complex negotiation process between teachers and students (see Woods, 1978). This line of inquiry points to the possibility that teachers sometimes seek to achieve order by selecting only tasks which are familiar and easy for students.

In developing this line of reasoning, Doyle (1983) has argued that academic work involving higher level cognitive processes (understanding, reasoning, and problem formulation) is high in ambiguity and risk for students. Students respond to these factors by attempting to increase the explicitness of product specifications and reduce the stringency of accountability requirements (see especially Davis & McKnight, 1976). Such actions tend to slow down the flow of classroom events, reduce work involvement, and increase the frequency of misbehavior and disruption. That is, students' reactions to work create pressures on the management system. In response to these threats to order, teachers often simplify task demands and/or lower the risk for mistakes (see especially Doyle & Carter, 1984). In contrast, relatively simple and routine tasks involving memory or algorithms tend to proceed quite smoothly in class with little hesitation or resistance.

The tensions created by challenging academic work may lead experienced teachers to exclude such tasks in the first place.

Jorgenson (1977) found, for example, that elementary students tended to be assigned materials that fell below their abilities and that conduct was better when assigned work was easier for students. Studies by Stodolsky and her colleagues (Stodolsky, 1981; Stodolsky et al., 1981) in fifth-grade math and social studies and by Korth and Cornbleth (1982) in middle school science, English, and social studies found that tasks involving higher cognitive processes seldom occurred. Moreover, when such tasks did occur, they were scheduled during peer group projects or seatwork rather than recitations. In other words, higher level cognitive tasks were sheltered from the public arena of classrooms and assigned to formats in which student performance was private and accountability diffuse. Such a strategy reduces the possibility that tensions will occur in the activity system because students cannot do the work. Research is needed on whether this strategy of sheltering higher level academic tasks also affects students' perceptions of the importance or seriousness of this work.

In a preliminary analysis of academic tasks in junior high science, English, and mathematics classes, Doyle et al. (1983) found that teachers often used efficient production systems in which tasks were presented in small and heavily prompted increments. Such work systems were smooth running and high in output but low in ambiguity and in decision making about content by students. The tasks, in other words, involved very little higher level thinking by students.

One contrast from this project was especially illustrative of the tension between management and curriculum. In one of the science classes studied, the teacher devoted a 6-week grading period to 14 tasks organized around two related units: (a) the metric system and

laboratory measurement, and (b) scientific research methods. An analysis of content strands in this class suggests that the task system was tied together by a strong semantic thread. Major and minor tasks within units were closely interrelated and built upon one another in a careful, logical progression. In addition, the optional tasks were thematically related to the core tasks. Finally, the teacher often required students to apply concepts and procedures to novel situations and problems, thus pushing students to understand the content. At the same time, time allocations were generous and flexible. Particularly at the end of units, students who were often absent or who worked quite slowly were given ample time, strong prompts, and opportunities to get help from other students. And the observer noted that daily management of the class, especially in the areas of accountability, monitoring student progress, sustaining task involvement, and controlling time allocations was sometimes difficult. In other words, the teacher had a strong content system, but the enactment of this system occasionally had ragged edges. On some days, therefore, the class did not appear to be well managed. In a companion science class, students completed 30 tasks related to the circulatory and digestive systems. Although the teacher covered a large amount of content, development across the term did not seem to follow a clear, logical progression. Indeed, it often appeared as though topics were scheduled on the basis of management considerations primarily, that is, on the basis of how work events fit into the timeframes of class meetings or how they appealed to students. From the perspective of the content, the sequence often appeared to be arbitrary. Yet, a large amount of work was completed and student engagement was high throughout the term. Moreover, there is no clear

evidence that the students were bothered by the apparent lack of content progression or integration. There was a logic to the work system, that is, tasks were predictable and easy to accomplish, and the students seemed satisfied with this arrangement.

The central problem illustrated in these examples, however, is that judgments of teaching based solely on management criteria can push the curriculum aside and reduce the opportunity students have to accomplish tasks involving higher level cognitive processes.

Subject Matter as Procedure

Some investigators have also suggested that subject matter is proceduralized in order to satisfy management demands, that is, academic work is reduced by teachers and students to a set of procedures to be followed in completing assignments. In such classes, the emphasis is on practice and completion, and instruction consists primarily of directions for completing worksheets. In addition, neither teachers nor students talk much about the meaning, purposes, or underlying operations of the content, and students seldom receive corrective feedback when they make errors (see Anderson, 1983; Bloome, 1981, 1983; Blumenfeld et al., 1983; Cornbleth & Korth, 1983; Duffy & McIntyre, 1982; Durkin, 1979; Leinhardt, Zigmond, & Cooley, 1981; Stake & Easley, 1978; Whitmer, 1982). Although there is often an appearance of engagement, the working is often counterfeit, that is, faked or done without understanding (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1982; Woods, 1978). In addition, lessons can move along quite smoothly without high quality cognitive engagement with the content (see Eaton, Anderson, & Smith, 1984; Green, 1983; Harker, 1983).

In some ways, this emphasis on procedure is understandable because students spend a great deal of time in school completing products that are evaluated. In addition, lengthly and complex explanations of content which are not related to an immediate assignment are not likely to elicit student involvement. Finally, formulating process explanations for errors after a student completes an answer must be done at the end of a turn when the natural rhythm is to move to another participant. Nevertheless, excessive proceduralizing would appear to circumvent the purposes of the curriculum.

Interference with Instruction and Learning

Finally, investigators have documented that management processes can interfere with the quality of instruction students receive, especially in low ability classes in which management is a prevailing theme. For example, practices of prompting student performance and alerting group attention in reading groups would appear to reduce the opportunities low ability students have for learning to read (Allington, 1980; McDermott, 1976). Indeed, Eder (1982) noted that the first-grade teacher in her study often accepted student-initiated interruptions during reading turns for the low ability group but reprimanded such attempts in the higher ability groups. As a result, attempts to interrupt decreased between fall and spring observations in the high groups and increased in the low group. Eder argues that because of the teacher's practice of allowing group members to participate in reading turns, the low ability students were not learning appropriate rules for turn-taking in other classroom groups.

Research on teacher expectations and differential teacher treatment of students in classes indicates that low ability students are often not

called on or are given limited opportunities to respond in whole-class settings (see Brophy, 1983; Good, 1981). In other words, some teachers appear to solve the problem of order in large-group lessons by excluding lower ability students from participation in classroom activities. From a management perspective, such action is reasonable in the sense that it avoids conditions which threaten the activity system. At the same time, such actions can restrict the opportunities some students have to learn.

Summary and Conclusions

Programs of action in classrooms are defined by both the rules for social participation and the demands of academic work. For this reason, academic work is directly involved in the process of achieving classroom order and can be shaped in basic ways by a teacher's management decisions. Indeed, research reviewed in this paper suggests that academic work can be swamped by the management function in teaching, and teachers can become preoccupied with getting work accomplished rather than promoting student learning. When this happens, management limits students' opportunities to learn even though engagement may be high. In such circumstances, a well managed class would not be a high achieving class. At the same time, some challenging academic tasks are difficult to manage in classrooms. When such tasks are being used, the class may not score high on such management indicators as attention and engagement. Nonetheless, students are being afforded the chance to learn important aspects of the curriculum.

Two important implications would seem to follow from the present analysis. First, content needs to be included in studies of classroom management. It is necessary, in other words, to know what is happening to the curriculum when order is being achieved. This necessity has both

theoretical and practical origins. A search for relationships between management variables and student achievement without considering curriculum has no theoretical justification. How can it be that noninstructional factors can have a direct influence on achievement? Such an analysis is akin to positing a student mediating process paradigm and then correlating teaching behaviors with outcomes. You might find significant correlations, but they are theoretically meaningless. A search for connections between management and achievement without considering curriculum can also have detrimental practical consequences. This search implies that it is possible to judge instructional effectiveness with management indicators. Such a practice easily leads to an emphasis on order rather than learning, an emphasis that can, in turn, lead to a selection of only those academic tasks which can be easily managed. The unintended consequence, then, is a narrowing of the curriculum.

Second, resolving the tension between management and curriculum in classrooms may actually require a greater emphasis on management. For example, including low ability students into the center of the activity and task systems of a class requires well developed management skills that enable a teacher to compensate for the pressures such students place on the activity system (see Sanford & Evertson, 1981). In other words, solving the instructional problems of low ability students cannot be done by de-emphasizing management or by designing more complex instructional arrangements for the classroom. Indeed, such "solutions" are likely to increase the problems they are designed to rectify. A more appropriate answer to the problem would seem to involve improved knowledge and training in management so that teachers can be free to

concentrate on instructional solutions to learning problems (see Good, 1983).

Clearly, then, studies of management processes must incorporate information about the academic work that students and teachers are trying to accomplish. Isolating social interaction or organizational features from the substance and purposes of classroom events can easily distort the picture one gets of how classrooms work. Moreover, the evidence suggests that fundamental tensions exist between management and instructional processes in classrooms. Because of the consequences of this tension for both order and learning, the topic warrants a position of high priority in research on classroom organization and management.

References

Abrahamson, J. H. (1974). Classroom constraints and teacher coping strategies: A way to conceptualize the teaching task. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Adams, R. S. (1969). Location as a feature of instructional interaction. Merrill Parker Quarterly, 15(4), 309-321.

Allington, R. L. (1980). Teacher interruption behaviors during primary grade oral reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 371-377.

Allington, R. L. (1983). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading abilities. Elementary School Journal, 83(5), 548-559.

Anderson, L. (1983, April). Achievement-related differences in students' responses to seatwork. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Arlin, M. (1979). Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 42-56.

Arlin, M. (1982). Teacher responses to student time differences in mastery learning. American Journal of Education, 90, 334-352.

Atwood, R. (1983, April). The interacting effects of task form and activity structure on students' task involvement and teacher evaluations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Au, K. H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11, 91-115.

Bellack, A. A., Kliebard, H. M, Hyman, R. T., & Smith, F. L. (1966). The language of the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bloome, D. (1981, April). Reading and writing in a classroom: A sociolinguistic ethnography. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Bloome, D. (1983, April). Definitions and functions of reading in two middle school classrooms: A sociolinguistic ethnographic study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Hamilton, V. L., Bossert, S. T., Wessels, K., & Meece, J. (1983). Teacher talk and student thought: Socialization into the student role. In J. Levine & M. Wang (Eds.), Teacher and student perceptions: Implications for learning. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brophy, J. E. (1982). How teachers influence what is taught and learned in classrooms. Elementary School Journal, 83, 1-13.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75(5), 631-661.

Cazden, C. B. (1985). Classroom discourse. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Cornbleth, C., & Korth, W. (April, 1983). Doing the work: Teacher perspectives and meanings of responsibility. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Davis, R. B., & McKnight, C. (1976). Conceptual, heuristic, and S-algorithmic approaches in mathematics teaching. Journal of Children's Mathematical Behavior, 1(Supplement 1), 271-286.

Denscombe, M. (1980). "Keeping 'em quiet": The significance of noise for the practical activity of teaching. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school (pp. 61-83). London: Croom Helm.

deVoss, G. G. (1979). The structure of major lessons and collective student activity. Elementary School Journal, 80, 8-18.

Doyle, W. (1979a). Classroom tasks and students' abilities. In P. L. Peterson & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Doyle, W. (1979b). Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management. 78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 2). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Doyle, W. (1980). Classroom management. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. Review of Educational Research, 53(2), 159-199.

Doyle, W. (1984). How order is achieved in classrooms: An interim report. Journal of Curriculum Studies. 16,(3), 259-277.

Doyle, W. (1985). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic tasks in classrooms. Curriculum Inquiry, 14(2), 129-149.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Doyle, W., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., French, B. S., & Emmer, E. T. (1983). Managing academic tasks: Interim report of the junior high school study (R&D Rep. 6186). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Duffy, G. G., & McIntyre, L. D. (1982). A naturalistic study of instructional assistance in primary-grade reading. Elementary School Journal, 83(1), 15-23.

Durkin, D. (1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 14, 481-533.

Eaton, J. F., Anderson, C. W., & Smith, E. L. (1984). Students' misconceptions interfere with science learning: Case studies of fifth-grade students. Elementary School Journal, 84, 365-379.

Eder, D. (1982). Differences in communicative styles across ability groups. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in classrooms (pp. 245-264). New York: Academic Press.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 38(4), 342-347.

Englert, C. S., & Semmel, M. I. (1983). Spontaneous teacher decision making in interactive instructional contexts. Journal of Educational Research, 77(2).

Erickson, F. (1982a). Classroom discourse as improvisation: Relationships between academic task structure and social participation structure in lessons. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in classrooms (pp. 153-181). New York: Academic Press.

Erickson, F. (1982b). Taught cognitive learning in its immediate environment: A neglected topic in the anthropology of education. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 13, 149-180.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Erickson, F., & Mohatt, G. (1982). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Florio, S., Clark, C. M., Elmore, J. L., Martin, S. J., Maxwell, R. J., & Metheny, W. (1982, March). What can you learn about writing in school? A case study in an elementary classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Gannaway, H. (1976). Making sense of school. In M. Stubbs & S. Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in classroom observation. London, England: John Wiley.

Good, T. L. (1981). Teacher expectations and student perceptions: A decade of research. Educational Leadership, 38, 415-422,

Green, J. L. (1983, April). Lesson construction and student participation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics, vol. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press.

Gump, P. V. (1967). The classroom behavior setting: Its nature and relation to student behavior (final report). Washington, DC: Office of Education, Bureau of Research. (ERIC Document No. ED015515)

Gump, P. V. (1969). Intra-setting analysis: The third grade classroom as a special but instructive case. In E. Williams & H. Rausch (Eds.), Naturalistic viewpoints in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Hargreaves, D. H., Hester, S. K., & Mellor, F. J. (1975). Deviance in classrooms. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Harker, J. O. (1983, April). Contrasting the content of two story-reading lessons: A propositional analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Hoffman, J. V., & Clements, R. O. (1984). Reading miscues and teacher verbal feedback. Elementary School Journal, 84, 481-491.

Jorgenson, G. W. (1977). Relationship of classroom behavior to the accuracy of the match between material difficulty and student ability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69(1), 24-32.

King, L. H. (1980). Student thought processes and the expectancy effect (Res. Rep. 80-1-8). Edmonton, Canada: Centre for Research in Teaching, The University of Alberta.

King, L. H. (1983). Pupil classroom perceptions and the expectancy effect. The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 11(1), 54-70.

Korth, W., & Cornbleth, C. (1982, March). Classroom activities as settings for cognitive learning opportunity and instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kounin, J., & Gump, P. (1974). Signal systems of lesson settings and the task related behavior of preschool children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 554-562.

LeCompte, M. D. (1978). Learning to work: The hidden curriculum of the classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 9(1), 22-37.

Leinhardt, G., Zigmond, N., & Cooley, W. W. (1981). Instruction in schools. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 343-361.

Mayers, P., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1978, March). The daily experience of high school students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada.

McDermott, R. P. (1976). Kids make sense: An ethnographic account of the interactional management of success and failure in one first-grade classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. Language in Society, 7(2), 183-213.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in a classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merritt, M. (1982). Distributing and directing attention in primary classrooms. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom (pp. 223-244). New York: Academic Press.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1983). Instructional strategy and the "creation" of classroom status. American Educational Research Journal, 20, 645-661.

Morrison, B. S. (1982). An investigation of reading as a learning activity in grade 9 social studies, science, and English classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Nash, R. (1976). Pupils' expectations of their teachers. In M. Stubbs & S. Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in classroom observations. London: John Wiley.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classrooms. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. Johns, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pollard, A. (1980). Teacher interests and changing situations of survival threat in primary school classrooms. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school (pp. 34-60). London: Croom Helm.

Ross, R. P. (1984). Classroom segments: The structuring of school time. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), Time and school learning: Theory, research and practice. London: Croom Helm.

Rowe, M. B. (1974). Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic, and fate control: I. Wait-time. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11, 81-94.

Sanford, J. P., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Classroom management in a low SES junior high: Three case studies. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(1), 34-38.

Shultz, J. & Florio, S. (1979). Stop and freeze: The negotiation of social and physical space in a kindergarten/first grade classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10(3), 166-181.

Sieber, R. T. (1981). Socialization implications of school discipline, or how first-graders are taught to "listen". In R. T. Sieber & A. J. Gordon (Eds.), Children and their organizations: Investigations in American culture (pp. 18-43). Boston, MA: G. K. Hall & Co.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, D. K. (1978, March). A study of contrasting styles of teacher behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Stake, R. E., & Easley, J. A. (1978). Case studies in science education (Vols. 1 & 2). Urbana: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation and Committee on Culture and Cognition, The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne.

Stodolsky, S. S. (1981, April). Subject matter constraints on the ecology of classroom instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Stodolsky, S. S., Ferguson, T. L., & Wimpelberg, K. (1981). The recitation persists, but what does it look like? Journal of Curriculum Studies, 13, 121-130.

Tousignant, M., & Siedentop, D. (1982, November). A qualitative analysis of task structures in required secondary physical education classes. Unpublished manuscript, Universite Laval, Departement d'education physique, Ste-foy, Quebec, Canada.

Westbury, I. (1973). Conventional classrooms, "open" classrooms and the technology of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5, 99-121.

Whitmer, S. P. (1982, March). A descriptive multimethod study of teacher judgment during the marking process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Woods, P. (1978). Negotiating the demands of school work. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 10, 309-327.

Yinger, R. J. (1980). A study of teacher planning. Elementary School Journal, 80, 107-127.